



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. None

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP  
P.O. BOX 10500  
MCLEAN VA 22102

**COPY MAILED**  
**JUL 31 2006**  
**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of	:
Konstantin Nikolaevitch	:
Koshelev et al.	:
Application No. 10/664,065	:
Filed: September 17, 2003	:
Attorney Docket No.: 081468-0306001	:
Title: RADIATION SOURCE,	:
LITHOGRAPHIC APPARATUS AND	:
DEVICE MANUFACTURING METHOD	:

This is a decision on the petition filed on November 8, 2005, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181, requesting that the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application be withdrawn.

The Office regrets the period of delay in issuing this decision.

BACKGROUND

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to file a proper response to the Restriction Requirement, mailed April 19, 2005, which set a shortened statutory period to reply for one month. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were received. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on May 20, 2005. A Notice of abandonment was mailed on October 25, 2005.

RELEVANT PORTION OF THE MPEP

Section 503 of the MPEP, entitled Application Number and Filing Receipt, sets forth, in part:

RETURN POSTCARD

If a receipt of any item (e.g., paper or fee) filed in the USPTO is desired, it may be obtained by enclosing with the paper a self-addressed postcard specifically identifying the item. The USPTO will stamp the receipt date on the postcard and place it in the outgoing mail. A postcard receipt which itemizes and properly identifies the items which are being filed serves as *prima facie* evidence of receipt in the USPTO of all the items listed thereon on the date stamped thereon by the USPTO.

The identifying data on the postcard should be so complete as to clearly identify the item for which receipt is requested. For example, the postcard should identify the applicant's name, application number (if known), confirmation number (if known), filing date, interference number, title of the invention, etc. The postcard should also identify the type of paper being filed, e.g., new application, affidavit, amendment, notice of appeal, appeal brief, drawings, fees, motions, supplemental oath or declaration, petition, etc., and the number of pages being submitted. If a new application is being filed, all parts of the application being submitted should be separately listed on the postcard, e.g., the number of pages of specification (including written description, claims and abstract), number of claims, number of sheets of drawings, number of pages of oath/declaration, number of pages of cover sheet (provisional application).

The postcard receipt will not serve as *prima facie* evidence of receipt of any item which is not adequately itemized on the postcard. For example, merely listing on the postcard "a complete application" or "patent application" will not serve as a proper receipt for each of the required components of an application (e.g., specification (including claims), drawings (if necessary), oath or declaration and the application filing fee) or missing portions (e.g., pages, sheets of drawings) of an application if one of the components or portion of a component is found to be missing by the USPTO. Each separate component should be specifically and properly itemized on the postcard. Furthermore, merely incorporating by reference in the postcard receipt, the items listed in a transmittal letter will not serve as *prima facie* evidence of receipt of those items.

The person receiving the item(s) in the USPTO will check the listing on the postcard against the item(s) being filed to be sure they are properly identified and that all the items listed on the postcard are presently being submitted to the USPTO. If any of the items listed on the postcard are not being submitted to the USPTO, those items will be crossed off and the postcard initialed by the person receiving the items.

Upon return of a postcard receipt from the USPTO, the postcard receipt should be promptly reviewed by the person who filed the items to ensure that every item specifically denoted on the postcard was received by the USPTO. If the postcard receipt has been annotated to indicate that a particular item denoted on the postcard was not received by the USPTO, the postcard receipt will not serve as *prima facie* evidence of receipt of that item in the USPTO.

ANALYSIS

With the present petition, Petitioner has asserted that a response to this communication was submitted on May 18, 2005. Petitioner has submitted a copy of this submission, and it contains a postcard receipt which contains the identifying data "Response/Amendment" and "Amd/Resp Transmittal," as well as a date stamp from the Office of Initial Patent Examination dated May 18, 2005.

Petitioner has requested that the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application be withdrawn. It is clear that a response was timely submitted. Considering the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue, as set forth on petition, it is concluded that petitioner has met his burden of establishing that a submission was timely submitted.

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181(a) is **GRANTED**. The holding of abandonment is **WITHDRAWN**.

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will notify the Examiner of this decision, so that the response which was received with the present petition can be processed.

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225<sup>1</sup>. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.



**Paul Shanoski**  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions  
United States Patent and Trademark Office

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. §1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).